Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Upon looking back, it is with some pain that we find how much we have dwelt upon Mr. Irving's defects. If, however, a man may trust that the feelings which lead him to his remarks, will naturally appear in his manner, we have no fear that Mr. Irving will think we took any pleasure in pointing out his faults. Had we thought less highly of his powers, we should have said less about his errors. Did we not take delight in reading him, we should have been less earnest about his mistakes. The truth is, that in this part of our notice of him, we have been more anxious for the literary character of our country, than for his fame, or our own pleasure. He is a man of genius, and able to bear his faults. But then, again, he is the most popular writer in this country, and for aught we can see, is likely to be, for years. At least, he will always be a standard author amongst us. Our literary character is said to be forming. But if we have discovered some talent and industry, we have, likewise, shown an abundance of bad taste. We cannot have a right character, till this is corrected; and the sanction of Mr. Irving to some of our errors, would give them a growth which would take years of our dull toiling to root out.

Here we must at last close, looking for another Sketch Book, with as pleasant articles, as Rural Life in England, and other tales in the manner of Rip Van Winkle, a little longer, and no less circumstantial.

ART. XVIII.—*A History of the United States before the Revolution, with some account of the Aborigines. By Ezekiel Sanford.* 8vo. pp. 532. Philadelphia, 1819.

THE history of the American States, antecedent to the revolution, is not a subject on which an author can enter with very sanguine hopes of success. The incidents to be recorded are sufficiently interesting and important, especially to an American reader, but there is not enough of unity in the subject to admit of its being wrought advantageously into a single history. It will be at best but a combination of distinct histories, which subsequent events only show the propriety of uniting in a single narrative.

The author before us has undertaken to furnish, in a sin-

gle volume, a history of the United States from their origin to the date of the revolution, together with an account of the native inhabitants of the country. The subject presents a vast field of inquiry, and besides the difficulty which we have mentioned, of want of unity, which no labour or skill could remove, is attended with the further difficulty which nothing but great care and perseverance can overcome, of requiring a thorough knowledge of a vast variety of facts, which are to be collected from a thousand different sources, and collated from a confused mass of uncertain, and sometimes contradictory testimony. It is not a volume of facts only which the author is bound to know. He must be acquainted with the whole history, in all its details, or he cannot write a faithful and satisfactory summary of it. Otherwise he will state some facts erroneously, he will suppress others not with discretion, but from ignorance, and will give a false character to his whole narration. What is unknown to him will be passed over as if it never had happened, what he does not understand will be treated as of little importance, and when the real causes of events or motives of actions are beyond the reach of his investigation, the place of them will be supplied with those which are imaginary. We fear that our author reflected too little upon this truth, and that when he undertook to give a summary of American history, *sequi fastigia rerum,** as he expresses it, he was not sufficiently aware of the necessity of possessing himself of particulars, before he was qualified to make general statements,—of exploring the recesses, before he could safely pass over the summits.

The author cautions us that he 'must not be supposed to hope, that he has superseded the necessity of all other American histories.' We should have been, without his admonition, far from believing him so vain of his labours. We cannot believe him incapable of estimating the imperfections of his work, or doubt his ability to remove many of them, had he duly weighed the responsibility he assumed in publishing such a book. We fear that in his haste to complete his volume he forgot what he owed to his own reputation, as well as to the public. The task of writing the history of a great empire is not the labour of a few months, and he who thinks

* The barbarous latin *sequari fastigia rerum,* used in the *advertisement* prefixed to the work, we put to the account of the printer, though we do not find it noticed among the typographical errors.

to accomplish it without great care and patient industry, deals falsely with his readers by treating as a sport and pastime, that which he ought to regard as a solemn and responsible office.

The first portion of the work is devoted to an account of the Aborigines, and is divided into three sections under the heads of Fabulous History—Uncertain History—and More Certain History. Under the first head, the author considers the question of the origin and the people of America. This inquiry might, perhaps, with more propriety, be denominated conjectural than fabulous history. After considering several hypotheses, not deserving of much attention in a work of this sort, he comes to the more rational one, of the emigration from the North East coast of Asia to the North West coast of America.

'By far the most numerous class of writers,' says he, 'are of opinion that America was peopled by wanderers from Asia, across Bhering's Strait. The shortest distance between the two continents at this place, is only forty miles; the strait is entirely frozen over in winter; and as there are known to be inhabitants upon the two opposite shores, it seems easy to conclude, that they once belonged to the same people. The objection that the Tchutchi, on the Asiatic, and the Esquimaux on the American side, are very different from the other tribes of the respective continents, is by no means conclusive; for it still remains to be determined, whether peculiarities of climate, and different modes of life, are not sufficient to account for all these diversities of feature, form, and habit. Perhaps, indeed, the only insurmountable objection to this hypothesis, is, that, to account for the emigration of men, will unveil but half of the mystery:—our animals too must have come from Noah's ark; and the misfortune of the theory is that it supposes beasts and birds, which cannot exist beyond the tropical parallels, to have crossed over at a place, where spirits of wine are almost congealed.' pp. xix, xx.

We do not perceive any necessity for supposing that the first men and animals sought this continent in the same caravan, or that they approached it by the same route. The question of the origin of the people of America is therefore distinct from that of the derivation of its animals, and it ought not to be clogged with difficulties which do not belong to it.

It is not necessary to the support of this hypothesis to sup-

pose that the emigrants from the old continent sought a passage precisely at Bhering's Straits. A passage might be easily effected in boats not superior to those which were common among the natives of most parts of America, by way of the Kurile and Aleutian Islands, twelve or fifteen degrees south of Bhering's Straits, between 50 and 55 degrees of north latitude, and consequently in a climate of no remarkable severity. The present inhabitants of those islands make much longer voyages than the greatest distance between the islands, in boats of a very small size, made of leather. The objection that the Tchutchi or Tschuktschians, and the Esquimaux 'are very different from the other tribes of the respective continents,' is altogether imaginary. We know of no satisfactory authority for believing that the Esquimaux have extended themselves across the continent, and border on Bhering's Straits. It is well established that they have an eastern origin. Mackenzie says, that the progress of the 'Esquimaux, who possess the sea coast from the Atlantic through Hudson's Straits and the Bay, round to Mackenzie's river (and I believe further) is known to be westward; they never quit the coast, and agree in appearance, manners, language, and habits with the inhabitants of Greenland.' If it be true, that some few of them have seated themselves on the borders of Bhering's Straits, we do not perceive how the fact militates with the supposition, that at former periods, the people of Asia have emigrated through these same regions to the more inviting parts of the American continent.

As to the Tschuktschians, if it be true that they are a distinct people from any of the neighbouring tribes of either continent, their location near the straits can have very little bearing on the question in consideration. They are not looked to as the parent stock of the emigrants, nor is it likely that the small numbers of these people, situated on the borders of the icy sea, supposing them to have always existed there, should have opposed any obstacle to the march of a more enterprising people who might be on their course to this continent. But it is not probable that there is any nation of an entirely distinct character, residing in these parts. If there are remarkable distinctive traits in tribes in this quarter bordering on each other, it would seem to countenance the idea, that they are but the fragments of successive nations, who in the tide of emigration may have been driven to

that region. Yet the fact seems to be, that the people bordering upon each other, on the shores of both continents, as well as upon the islands between them, have sufficient features of resemblance to prove that there has been, for a course of ages, a constant communication and intercourse preserved between them. In support of this opinion we quote the following description ot these people from Storch's view of Russia, a work of the highest authority.

'The nations which we include under the common title of the People of Eastern Siberia, are the Jukagirs, Kamtschadales, Korjaks, Tschuktschians, and the inhabitants of the North Eastern Archipelago of Siberian America, the Kurilians and the Aleutians. It is true there is some similarity among these people; the Jukagirs have a resemblance to the Jakutians, the Tschuktschians to the North Islanders, the Kamtschadales to the Kurilians; and the Korjaks form a link between the Tschuktschians and the Kamtschadales. But among all these people the diversity is much greater than the resemblance, and without the aid of historical records, which here fail entirely, scarcely a hope exists of being able to trace them to a common origin. For this reason we have not said any thing respecting their probable relationship, but confined ourselves to the description of their geographical situation, and their general character.'*

'The Korjaks inhabit the most northern part of the gulf of Penshinsk and even Northern Kamtschatka, near and between the Kamtschadales, Tungusians, Lamutians, and Tschuktschians. The circumstance that they do not appear in the history of their southern neighbours, and their great resemblance to many islanders in the Eastern Ocean, and to the nearest Americans on the other side of the strait, renders it probable with respect to them, as also for similar reasons with respect to the Tschuktschians, that they are very ancient inhabitants of this coast, who either came here from the continent of America, or were separated from it by the probable breaking through of the ocean, and the separation of the two parts of the world. The Korjaks in numbers about equal the Kamtschadales.

'The Tschuktschians inhabit the north eastern corner of Siberia near the Icy Sea and the Eastern Ocean, which is

* Gemalde des Russichen Reichs, Bd. I. S. 287.

called the Tschuktschian promontory, and they have so much resemblance to the Korjaks, that one is tempted to consider them as one family. They amount probably to about 4000.

'The Kurilians are the inhabitants of the islands named after them in the Eastern Ocean. They have not all the same name, and differ in language and manner of living. Some come from Japan, others from Kamtschatka. The Aleutians inhabit the chain of islands named after them, which stretch from Kamtschatka towards the northeast to the continent of America. They are, considering the size of the islands, moderately populous, and are now for the most part subjected to tribute.'*

Kodiak, the largest of the Aleutian Islands, lies close upon the American coast. Counsellor Langsdorf, who visited several of these islands, and the neighbouring American and Asiatic coasts, confirms the account here given of the similarity of the inhabitants of this part of the two continents. In his particular description of the inhabitants of some of these islands, he mentions several customs which form a striking coincidence with those of the natives of the Atlantic coast of America. Wichman, who quotes several of the late travellers, says, that the 'Kurilians, together with the Korjaks, Tschuktschians and the islanders further east, appear to form a gradual transition from the Mongul to the American character.'†

But we do not intend here to go into a defence of any of the modes of tracing the origin of the American Indians. Our attention is more forcibly drawn to other parts of this work. The author, after some notice of the several hypotheses which have been advanced by different writers, expresses an inclination of his mind in favour of that, 'which supposes the deluge to have been complete only in the old world,' and declares his disbelief, 'that any scheme can be found to derive the Aborigines of the Americas from Asia, Europe or Africa, which, in the present state of knowledge, may not be perplexed with numerous and irremovable objections.' He proceeds to attack the general course of reasoning by which the inquiries, which have been made on the subject, have been conducted.

* Gemalde des Russichen Reichs, Bd. I. S. 292—294.

† Darstellung der Russ. Mon. S. 220.

'Three topics of argument,' says he, 'are generally resorted to, in the discussion of this subject,—similarities of language, traditions, manners and monuments,*—which we have reserved for a separate consideration, because they are not exclusively applicable to any particular theory. It is their greatest objection indeed, that they have been applied with equal success to all. We cannot take the pains to enumerate the different hypotheses, which three centuries have produced, to develop and elucidate this mystery; but in all the various idioms of language and modes of life, which distinguish the aboriginal tribes of America, we have never known an author fail of finding a sufficient number of etymologies, customs and ceremonies to support the particular idea, which he has started or espoused. Though there may be ten dissimilarities for one resemblance, and though that one resemblance be imperfect and obscure, the novelty of a beautiful hypothesis eclipses all other considerations; and tribes, which can hardly be said to have a single thing in common, are pronounced to be branches of the same people.' pp. xxv, xxvi.

What is there, we would ask, by which, in the absence of all written history, the origin or relationship of a people should be traced, but by their monuments if they have any, their traditions, manners, or language? Yet it is gravely argued, that because these kinds of evidence have been resorted to by the supporters of contradictory opinions, the evidence itself is of no value. Is there no room for the supposition that the evidence has been in some cases, and perhaps even in all, misapplied, through a defect of information in those who have resorted to it? This being the only kind of evidence which the nature of the case admits of, is it remarkable that each founder or defender of an hypothesis should find 'a sufficient number of etymologies, customs and ceremonies to support' his own theory? The author proceeds:

'Solinus mentions a nation of Asiatics called the Apalæi; and in Herodotus, we read of the Massagetæ in the neighbourhood of the Caspian Sea. The former are found in the Apalachi of Florida; the latter in the Mazaticæ of New Spain, and the Massachusitæ of New England. Ptolemy speaks of the Tabieni; and the Tambi were an ancient nation of Peru. The Cunadani inhabited the north of Asia; and there was a city in Upper Hungary, called Chunad. No person, therefore, could mistake the derivation of Canada. The Chonsuli about Nicaragua are identified with

* Here seem to be four, instead of three topics enumerated.

the Hunni or Chuni; and the Parii of Scythia are supposed to have named the South American region of Paria. The Hurons are a branch of the Huyrones, who live in the neighbourhood of the Moguls. The Olopali of Florida, the Nepi of Trinidad, and the Iroquois of the North, are the same with the Parii, the Nepi, and Irycæ of Herodotus. The Moguls are the progenitors of the Tomogali and Mogoles about the river La Plata; and how nearly do the Choten, Baita, and Tangur, of Great Tartary, resemble the Coton of Chili, and the Paita and Tangora of Peru? The Japanese are found under both their appellations. The Chiapanecæ about Nicaragua retain their common name; and the Zipangri of Hispaniola, the one which was given them by the Tartars. The word Sacks is one synonime of the Celts; and there is a tribe of Indians who have the same name to a letter. The Abydos of the Greeks has since been called Nagara; and our Niagara corresponds with it, both in name and situation.

'The Peruvians think they descended from one Mancu; and there are Manchew Tartars. The natives of Virginia and Guatimala are said to have a tradition concerning Madoc; and his name has been detected as a part of the Guatimalan Matoc-Zunga and Mat-Inga. The double L of the Spanish is said to have been derived from the Mexicans, who took it from the Welsh; and when the Dutch first carried to Europe a bird, which they found at the Straits of Magellan, and which the natives called Penguin, the Welsh discovered, that, with the aptest correspondence to its description, the same word in their own language, signified White-head.' pp. xxvi—xxviii.

It is with such displays of his wit and fancy, that the author, forgetful of the true offices of history, regales his readers. It must be unnecessary to remark, that this has no reference to facts actually relied upon by the authors whom he is attempting to refute, but is the work of his own ingenuity, intended to ridicule the labour of those who by an investigation of the languages of this continent, yet very little understood, are endeavouring to recover something of its lost history. Our sense of the value of these inquiries we have already expressed in a former number. These languages when better understood, we have little doubt, will render very efficient aid in determining the question of the origin of the American people, and together with the other modes of evidence, which the author endeavors to persuade us are worthless, will lead to the establishment of a theory on this subject which shall be entirely satisfactory. Much

has been already done by these very means. We deem it, for example, sufficiently well established, that the Esquimaux, who people a very extensive tract of this continent, derive their origin from the north of Europe, and that they are an entirely distinct race of people from the other Indians who border upon them. It is precisely by the modes of proof which the author takes so much pains to undervalue, that these facts are established, and we know not what further is necessary to lead to similar results with respect to the other nations of the continent, than an equally intimate acquaintance with their language, traditions, manners and customs, and a competent acquaintance with the history, language and character of the different nations of the old world.

The author thinks it idle to argue on this subject from a similarity of customs, and contends that the coincidences that are to be observed in the usages of the inhabitants of the two continents, are to be regarded as a natural consequence of a similarity of character and constitution, inherited by the whole human race.

'Were two nations,' says he, 'created at the same time, and placed on opposite sides of the globe, we should naturally expect, from the similarity of their constituent principles, that their advances to civilization would be parallel, at least, if the lines did not occasionally run into each other.' p. lvi.

And again,

'There are even many things common to us and the lower animals. We have never known either man or beast to adopt but one course. When struck with violent fear;—they uniformly run. Anger is generally accompanied by a disposition to revenge; and always vents itself upon the object which occasions it, or upon the first thing which it encounters. The miss chastises her perverse doll, and the grown person dashes his obstinate boot across the room. Grief too, when excessive, is generally attended with a species of resentment; and if the Mexicans, like the Jews, are found to rend their garments in violent lamentation, it does not prove that the Mexicans are descended from the Jews,—but that both Jews and Mexicans are descended from Adam.' p. lvii.

This reasoning is quite inconclusive. It is not from *similarity*, merely, of character and conduct in two people, that the argument in support of their common origin is drawn; but from their possessing in common certain peculiarities, or

characteristic traits, by which they are distinguished from every other people, and which consequently cannot result from the common constitution of human nature. There may undoubtedly be coincidences in the distinguishing traits of different people, which are rather to be attributed to accident, than regarded as proofs of relationship; yet it is too obvious to need demonstration, that there are others of so marked and striking a character, as to deserve great consideration in the investigation of this subject.

The second section of this work, styled Doubtful History, is devoted to the consideration of the question, whether the territory of the United States, since its first discovery by the Europeans, has been inhabited by two distinct races of Indians. The affirmative of this question is supported at considerable length, though the author does not declare himself decidedly in favour of this opinion. The testimony principally relied upon is drawn from the description of the natives of this country, by Verazzano, and the narrative of De Soto's expedition. The hypothesis, we think, is entirely unsupported. The whole history of this continent, both written and traditionary, contradicts it. The accounts of the condition of the Indian nations, by those adventurers, are easily reconciled with their actual condition at the date of the more deliberate and accurate observations of subsequent travellers, if we make some slight allowance for the glowing fancy with which the early adventurers described, and still more perhaps, for the actual deterioration of the character and condition of the natives in consequence of their connexion with the Europeans. The narrative of De Soto's expedition, abridged from Hackluyt's Voyages, which constitutes the greater part of this section, as it is not very generally known, forms one of the most interesting portions of the volume.

The third section consists of a general view of the history of the Indians, from the date of the first European settlements in this country to the present time.

We come next to the second and principal portion of the work; viz. the history of the states of the Union from their first settlement to the revolution. Here the author could complain of no deficiency of written and authentic documents. No country is furnished with more abundant and perfect materials for history than ours. Almost every

event, of any importance, may be found recorded by contemporary writers, and although contradictory statements may be frequently detected, the evidence is so ample, that in almost all cases the truth may be satisfactorily ascertained.

In a brief summary of history like that before us, the merits of the author must be found principally in the accuracy and precision with which he states facts, a judicious selection of the facts and events to be recorded, and a clear and judicious arrangement. The point of greatest importance, undoubtedly, is accuracy—perfect accuracy, wherever it is attainable, not only in the statement of facts, which are obviously important, but in all the minute details and accidental circumstances. Accuracy in dates, in particular, is of the greatest importance, as the whole fabric of history depends upon it. It is the chain by which the mutual dependence and connexion of facts are in a measure preserved, where systematical arrangement and method are entirely disregarded. No man can have a correct view of history or read it with satisfaction and profit, without a careful attention to dates. It should therefore be to the writer of history one of the first objects of attention.

In a point so important as that of accuracy in the detail of facts, and in dates, we have been sorry to observe so great a deficiency in the work before us. Every part of the volume betrays gross carelessness in this respect. We do not allude to mistakes which can claim the apology of an error in judgment in the choice of authorities, but to mistatements in matter of fact, upon which, on a careful examination, there is no room for doubt. We do not intend to pursue the work throughout for faults of this description, but will proceed to quote a few passages, in which we will endeavour to point out a sufficient number of errors to support the charge which we have made.

'In 1495, three years after the discovery of Columbus, he [King Henry VII.] entered into a sort of fellowship with John Cabot and his three sons; commissioning them to seize in his name, all the lands they could discover in the east, the north or the west; but stipulating that the voyage should be undertaken at their own expense, and that, of the trade which they might drive with the inhabitants, they should return their royal partner his due fifth of the clear gains. This scheme was never carried into execution; but *three years afterwards*, in May 1498, the elder Cabot,

and his second son, Sebastian, set sail from Bristol, with one ship and four barks; intending, if practicable, to reach the East Indies, through the short passage pointed out by Columbus. They held nearly a due west course, till they discovered the new continent; and after following the coast from the fifty-sixth to the thirty-eighth degree of north latitude, they steered homeward again, to carry the unwelcome intelligence that India was not to be attained in the west. *It does not appear that they ever landed;* and it is only upon this cursory traverse of the coast, that the English primarily found their claim to the whole continent of North America.' p. 2.

There is some contradiction in the different accounts of the discoveries made by the Cabots. But there seems to be no reason to doubt the following facts. The commission and grant made by Henry VII to John Cabot and his sons, was dated March 5, 1496. In this commission we discover nothing in the nature of a copartnership, except that it was a condition of the grant that one fifth of the clear profits on the goods imported from the newly discovered countries, was to be paid to the king in lieu of all other customs and duties. In May, 1497, a little more than one year after the date of the commission, Cabot sailed from Bristol, and June 24, he discovered land, at a place which he called Prima Vista, the location of which is not at present certainly known. Here he landed, and discovered among other things that the inhabitants were clothed with skins, that the country abounded in bears and stags, and in fish, particularly cod. He thence sailed northward to 60°,—Hakluyt and Purchas say 67° north latitude,—but returned to the place where he first landed, and having refreshed his crew there, proceeded along the coast southward to latitude 38° or 36°. On returning to England, he carried home three savages, as a present to the king. We do not find any evidence that England founded upon this discovery, any claim to the whole continent of North America. On the contrary, all the early grants of lands in North America by the king of England, contained the proviso, that the lands described were not possessed by any other Christian prince or people.

'The first ship fitted out by the Plymouth company, in 1606, was captured by the Spaniards. In the following year, however, Raleigh Gilbert set sail, with two other ships, and about one hundred persons; landed safely in America; and proceeded to build

Fort St. George, near the Sagahadoc [Sagadahoc.] The severity of the winter *carried off many of their number*—among the rest, *Gilbert, their admiral*, and George Popham, their president; and in the spring, when they learned, by a vessel which brought them supplies, that their patron, Sir John Popham, was dead, they determined at once to abandon the country.' pp. 31, 32.

The seat of this colony, under the command of Capt. George Popham, was at Parker's Island, in Georgetown, at the mouth of the Kennebeck river, in the country then called Sagadahoc. Popham was the only person who died during the winter, and until the settlement was abandoned. Gilbert succeeded Popham in the command of the party. They did not determine to abandon the colony on hearing of the death of Sir John Popham, nor until the intelligence afterwards received of Sir John Gilbert's death, rendered it necessary for Raleigh Gilbert, his brother, to return to England to take possession of the estate, to which he succeeded, on that event.

'The first effectual settlement of New England was almost entirely accidental. The *obscure sect of the Brownists* had been driven from England to Holland, where, *for the want of persecution, they found themselves in danger of becoming utterly extinct*; and as the only means therefore of continuing their existence as a body, they resolved upon emigrating to America.' p. 32.

This is one of the instances in which the author adopts a contemptuous tone, not warranted by historical justice, in speaking of the first settlers of New England. The term Brownist is one by which the people, who emigrated to Leyden and afterwards founded the Plymouth colony, were stigmatized by their contemporaries; but it was an appellation which they disavowed, and which Dr. Prince, in his invaluable New England Chronology, has satisfactorily shown did not belong to them. The Brownists were the most rigid sect of the Puritans, and vehemently insisted on a total separation from the church of England. Robinson, on the contrary, the father of the Leyden church, published a book, in which he allowed and defended the lawfulness of communicating with the church of England 'in the word and prayer,' and allowed the pious members of the church of England, and of all the reformed churches to communicate with his church. This liberality was so offensive to the Brownists,

that they would hardly hold communion with the church of Leyden. The members of this church were more properly called Independents or Congregationalists. They acknowledged all the doctrinal articles of the church of England, and differed from it only in matters of an ecclesiastical nature. In respect to these, they maintained the principles which are at the foundation of the congregational churches of this country to this day. Robinson, in his farewell address to that part of his flock which embarked for this continent, after a discourse which breathes a noble spirit of christian charity, not only remarkable at that day, but which has been often quoted with admiration in the present age, adds 'I must also advise you to abandon, avoid, and shake off the name of Brownist. It is a mere nickname; and a brand for the making religion, and the professors of it, odious to the Christian world.' The followers of Brown, who emigrated to Amsterdam, never came to this country. There is no truth therefore in tracing the origin of the New England settlements to 'the obscure sect of the Brownists.'

The reason assigned for the resolution of the founders of the Plymouth colony, to quit Holland for America, is equally false. The whole history of this transaction does not afford the least colour for the insinuation, which is conveyed in this pretended reason for their second emigration. The true reasons are very distinctly given in the writings which are extant of the emigrants themselves, and it would have been showing but a decent respect for historical truth and accuracy, had the author made some inquiry into these reasons, which appear to be entirely satisfactory, instead of assigning those which are purely imaginary. A part of the reasons mentioned by Governor Bradford and others are, that the climate of Holland proved unfavourable to their health,—that they were not pleased with the language, manners and habits of the Dutch, particularly their loose manner of regarding the sabbath—and that most of them having been bred to the business of husbandry in England, which they were unable to pursue in Holland, they were obliged to resort to modes of obtaining a subsistence to which they were not accustomed, and that in consequence they found themselves sinking into poverty, and some of their youth under the necessity of becoming sailors and soldiers.

'In September, 1620, *one hundred and twenty* set sail from England in a single ship. They intended to have settled on Hudson's River; but their Dutch pilot had been bribed by his countrymen to carry them somewhere else; and the first land they came in sight of, was what Gosnald had called Cape Cod. The coast was explored for a convenient place of settlement; and the colony landed at New Plymouth, *on the* 11*th of November*.' p. 33.

The precise number who sailed from England in this ship was one hundred and one; and the first landing at Plymouth was made on the 11th of December, the aniversary of which event is celebrated to this day on the 22d of December, New Style. This was the landing of an exploring party. The ship arrived in the harbor on the 16th, and the whole party did not land until some days after. They attended divine service on shore for the first time December 31, and named the place *Plymouth*. It was never called New Plymouth. The statement that 'their Dutch pilot had been bribed by his countrymen,' is at least, incorrect, if it is not entirely without foundation. The Mayflower, in which the voyage was made, was a London vessel, and Jones, the master, as well as Robert Coppin the pilot, appear to have been Englishmen. We find no authority whatever, for supposing that the pilot was bribed, and the story, which rests on the authority of Morton's Memorial, that the master of the vessel was bribed by some agents of the Dutch West India Company, is rendered improbable by a variety of circumstances.

'The season, in which they landed, was by no means favourable to their health; *such a sect very naturally fell into the improvident scheme of labouring in common;* and, before the return of spring, about fifty of their number were swept off by sickness and fatigue. The remainder were called away from their work, by *the necessity of fighting the savages;* and, had it not been for *a pestilence which swept off great numbers of their warriors;* the history of this settlement would have ended here. But the Indians were soon reduced to equitable terms.' p. 33.

What is said here of the Plymouth colonists labouring in common, is not strictly true. It was the course adopted by the Virginia settlers and others, but it was in part avoided by those of Plymouth. In Hazard's Collections we find, from the Plymouth Colony records, part of the plan of the "Meerstead's and Garden-plotes of those which came first,"

as recorded in 1620. In a journal of the plantation, 'first printed in 1622, and abbreviated in Purchas' Pilgrims,' we find the following record. "Tuesday, the ninth of January, [1621] was a reasonable fair day; and we went to labour that day in building of our town, in two rows of houses for more safety. We divided by lot the plot of ground, whereon to build our town, after the proportion formerly allotted. We agreed that every man should build his own house, thinking by that course men would make more haste than working in common. The common house, in which for the first we made our rendezvous, being nearly finished, wanted only covering."* Much of the labour for supporting the infant colony was of necessity done in common. It would have been impracticable at first for each family to build their house, clear their field, and gain a subsistence. The fields were consequently for the two first years planted in common, but in April, 1623, it was 'thought best, that every man should use the best diligence he could for his own preservation, both in respect to the time present, and to prepare his own corn for the year following; and bring in a competent portion for the maintenance of public officers, fishermen, &c. which could not be freed from their calling without greater inconveniency.'† This division of lands for cultivation is also to be found in Hazard's Collections. No division was made at this time 'for inheritance,' but the scheme, says Governor Bradford 'has very good success, makes all industrious, gives content.'

There are several other errors in this paragraph. The Indians never made war upon the Plymouth settlers, and, consequently, among the hardships which these pilgrims encountered in laying the foundation of their colony, they were not subjected to 'the necessity of fighting the savages.' There was no pestilence among the Indians after the landing of the Plymouth people. The country was nearly depopulated seven or eight years before their arrival. The Indians were not compelled to enter into any terms with the colonists, but before any hostilities they made a voluntary treaty of amity with them, which was faithfully observed. A very friendly intercourse subsisted between them, from the first interview, for many years.

* Mass. Hist. Coll. VIII. 223. † Winslow's Rel. Hist. Coll. VIII. 274.

'On the 3d of November, 1626, the original Plymouth company obtained from James a new patent.' p. 34.

The New England charter here mentioned, was granted in 1620. This error is probably from the fault of the printer.

'They came over and settled, in small parties, about Massachusetts Bay,—*so called from an Indian Sachem;* in March 1627, the Council of Plymouth granted to Sir Henry Roswell and others, all the lands between lines drawn to the South Sea, from three miles north of the Merrimack, and three miles south of Charles river; and in September of the same year, a number of planters and servants under Endicot, laid the foundation of Salem, the first permanent town in the colony.

'It was soon apparent, that without more opulent partners, the settlement would never come to any thing. Such partners were easily found; but they would only embark in the enterprise, upon the condition that the grant to [of] the council of Plymouth should be confirmed by a royal charter. Such a charter was accordingly issued on the 4th of March 1628. The name was changed to "The Governor and company of Massachusetts Bay in New England."' p. 35.

The origin of the name of Massachusetts Bay is not here correctly given. There was no sachem of that name. It was the name of an Indian nation which inhabited the country bordering on Boston harbour. There are also several mistakes of dates. The grant of the council of Plymouth to Roswell and others was made in the year 1628. As it is recited in the Massachusetts charter, it purports to have been made March 19, in the third year of the reign of Charles I. This year corresponds with the date we have mentioned. It is also well established, by a great variety of authorities, that the emigration of Endicot and his company did not take place until the year 1628, the same year of the grant to him and his associates. The royal charter is dated the 4th of March, in the 4th year of king Charles' reign, viz. 1629. The certificate annexed to it however, of the taking of the oath by Matthew Craddock, named governor in the charter, is dated March 18, 1628. This apparent contradiction, and the error of Hutchinson and others, which has been copied by our author in the dates of the council of Plymouth grant, and the royal charter of Massachusetts, are easily accounted for, by a reference to the practice retained longer in England and its

dependencies than in any other country, of commencing the year on the 25th of March, or annunciation day. By this mode of reckoning, the date of events happening between the 1st of January and the 25th of March, was thrown one year back. To remove the ambiguity arising from the diversity in the mode of reckoning, it became a common practice to use a double date for those months which had a doubtful station, both at the beginning and the end of the year. By this method, the Massachusetts charter should be dated March 4, 1628—9. Notwithstanding the inconvenience of this mode of dating, which was at variance with the practice of other nations, it was retained in use in England until the passing of the act for reforming the style in 1751. This act, besides suppressing the eleven days, to bring back the vernal equinox to the 21st of March, required that the year should begin on the 1st of January.

The grant from the council of Plymouth, to Roswell and others, gave them a sufficient title to the lands which afterwards formed the colony of Massachusetts. But the royal charter not only confirmed the grant, but established the grantees and their associates, as a body corporate and politic, with certain privileges and immunities by the name of 'the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England.'

'The legislative power was to be exercised by the whole body of proprietors; the executive, by a governor, and deputy governor, and eighteen assistants; but notwithstanding all the experience of Virginia with her councils in London, the supreme control was vested in a body of men three thousand miles distant from the scene of government.' p. 35.

The supreme control was vested, as is usual in corporations, in the body of corporators. These were at the date of the charter nearly all in England. But the government was not fixed there by the charter, nor did it continue there longer than the necessity of the case required, On sending out a party of settlers in April, a few weeks after receiving their charter, they ordered that thirteen persons in the plantation should 'have the sole ordering of the affairs and government there,' with full power to make any laws not repugnant to the laws of England; and in August following, several of the proprietors having already removed, and others being

about to remove to the infant colony, it was voted by the company, 'That the patent and government of the plantation be transferred to New England.' This transfer took place early in the following year, when the principal emigration of the proprietors took place,—the last general court in England being holden, February 10, 1630, and the last court of assistants there, on board the ship Arabella, March 23, of the same year. After this date no act of government or control was exercised by the proprietors in England. The persons who came over in 1628 and 1629 were principally the servants and agents of the proprietors who came over in the year following.

'*In June* of the same year, two hundred emigrants *in five vessels*, disembarked at Salem. The colony now amounted to *three hundred persons;* one third of whom removed to Charlestown. As Brownism was the great end of the undertaking, the settlers proceeded to frame a system of polity conformable to its doctrines,—and to refuse all others that toleration, for which they had themselves been the zealous advocates. The "rising glories of the faithful" were somewhat obscured by *the loss of half their number*, in the following winter; but the survivors were not disheartened.' p. 36.

The number of emigrants this year is stated by Prince, for which he quotes the Massachusetts colony records, as follows, viz. sixty women and maids, twenty six children, and three hundred men. Governor Dudley, in his letter to the Countess of Lincoln, says, 'the next year, 1629, we sent divers ships over with about 300 people.' To these numbers are to be added those who accompanied Endicot the year before. They sailed in six vessels, three of which arrived in June; the other three sailed from England some time in June. The colony probably exceeded 400 persons, and the number of deaths the following winter was about eighty—Dudley says 'above eighty.'

The same contemptuous tone towards the founders of the new Commonwealth, on which we have before remarked, is again observable in the passage which we have quoted, and occurs frequently in other parts of this volume. It is unnecessary for us here to go into a vindication of the character of our early ancestors. It is sufficient to remark, that they never professed themselves the advocates of toleration. Tol-

eration was not a virtue of the age in which they lived; and they ought not to be reproached with the want of it, since they cannot be charged with the opposite error, beyond every other Christian sect of that day. Their grand object was to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, and for this object they sought an asylum in the wilderness of this continent, where they should be removed from the sight of antichristian errors of every description. Nothing was farther from their thoughts, than to build up a republic in which sectarians and fanatics of every denomination under heaven might mingle their multifarious rites, and confound their modes of Christian worship with their own.

It would be useless in us to pursue this course of examination further. We have proceeded far enough, we trust, to support our charge of gross inaccuracy in the work before us—a charge which we are sensible is a very grave one, and ought not to be made but upon careful examination, and deliberate conviction of its truth. The paragraphs which we have here noticed are extracted from a very narrow space, and we might have brought together many more, from other parts of the volume, in confirmation of the judgment which we have given. But the task is as unpleasant as it would be profitless, and we are glad to cut it short.

We have but one further fault to notice in this work, and that is included in the general one which we have mentioned of want of accuracy, viz. a frequent false colouring of the character and motives of the actors in our early history. It furnishes not merely an imperfect, but often a deceptive account of their conduct, ascribes to them mean and frivolous motives, when good and sufficient ones might have been assigned, passes unnoticed their exertions and sacrifices, and exaggerates and caricatures their vices and foibles. It furnishes no means of estimating fairly the character of the people to whom it relates; and instead of presenting such a narrative as can be read with continued pleasure, from the frequent pictures of moral worth and excellence, which every age of our history actually affords, and which ought to meet us upon every page, it disgusts us with the perpetual recital of exertions without an honourable motive, sufferings without necessity, and controversies without an object. It presents us, in fine, no traces of that discipline which has made us what we are, and discloses none of the germs of the charac-

ter which we at this day sustain. It is not a work from which our true history is to be learned.

ART. XIX.—*Novanglus and Massachusettensis; or Political Essays, published in the years 1774 and 1775, on the principal points of controversy between Great Britain and her Colonies. The former by John Adams, late President of the United States; the latter by Jonathan Sewall, then King's Attorney General of the Province of Massachusetts Bay. To which are added a number of letters, lately written by President Adams to the Hon. William Tudor.* 8vo. pp. 312. Boston, Hews & Goss, 1819.

MUCH interest has been excited of late by the question,—who began the American revolution? By this we understand that change in the political relations of Great Britain and her Colonies, which arose from the controversy between them with regard to the authority of Parliament and terminated in the declaration of Independence,—for that was the completion of this change of government, the end of the revolution, and not, as some appear to think, its beginning. The zeal displayed in discussing the respective pretensions of those who are said to be its authors, might almost induce us to imagine that it had sprung forth at once in full maturity from the fertile brain of some individual, before whom we must fall down and worship. Not so;—it was the offspring of the nation, and grew up slowly; proceeding by cautious and reluctant advances, but acquiring strength and confidence at every step, from jealousy to discontent, murmurs, complaint, petition, remonstrance, menace, opposition and independence. Which of all these was the beginning of the revolution, and when and how they succeeded each other are questions, to which it is not easy to give an answer generally satisfactory. It is true indeed, that changes in the sentiments of a whole people cannot be secret, nor ordinarily accomplished by secret means; but they are often brought about by gradations too imperceptible to be fixed and measured, however astonishing their result. We are frequently unable to determine the progressive variations in our own sentiments and opinions; still more so to trace those, which take place among our daily